

Remarks

In response to the Office Action dated April 6, 2007, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration based on the above claim amendment and the following remarks. Applicants respectfully submit that the claims as presented are in condition for allowance. In the present application, independent claims 1, 10, 19, 31, 36, 37, 40, and 41 have been amended. The claims have been amended to clarify that validation parameters stored in a hierarchical, table-based system of a plurality of rules organized into at least a FIELD view, a CLASS view and a GLOBAL view, wherein the FIELD view is the view of first priority and contains validation parameters applicable to a specific field, the CLASS view is the view of second priority and contains validation parameters applicable to a specific class of fields and the GLOBAL view is the default view when there is no match to the data in the FIELD and CLASS views, wherein further the rules included in each of the FIELD view, CLASS view and GLOBAL view are prioritized in a predetermined execution sequence. Support for these amendments may be found throughout the specification but particularly on page 5 of the Specification. No new matter has been added.

In the Office Action, claims 1-2, 4, 6, 8, 10-11, 13, 15, 17, 19, 22, 24-26, 28, 31-32, 34, 36-38, and 40-41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Morris (U.S. 5,813,017) in view of Moore (U.S. 6,915,454). Claims 3, 5, 7, 9, 12, 14, 16, 18, 20-21, 23, 27, 29-30, 35, and 39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Morris in view of Official Notice.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1-2, 4, 6, 8, 10-11, 13, 15, 17, 19, 22, 24-26, 28, 31-32, 34, 36-38, and 40-41

Claims 1-2, 4, 6, 8, 10-11, 13, 15, 17, 19, 22, 24-26, 28, 31-32, 34, 36-38, and 40-41 are rejected as being unpatentable over Morris in view of Moore. The rejection of these claims is respectfully traversed.

Amended independent claim 1 specifies in pertinent part:

“[a] client-server computer system comprising...an application server accessible by a plurality of client application servers via a plurality of application software protocols, wherein said application server provides a data validation service on the data received from the client application server in response to receiving the validation request

from the client application server, wherein the data validation service compares the data in the initial form to validation parameters stored in a hierarchical, table-based system of a plurality of rules organized into at least a FIELD view, a CLASS view and a GLOBAL view, wherein the FIELD view is the view of first priority and contains validation parameters applicable to a specific field, the CLASS view is the view of second priority and contains validation parameters applicable to a class of fields and the GLOBAL view is the default view when there is no match to the data in the FIELD and CLASS views, wherein further the rules included in each of the FIELD view, CLASS view and GLOBAL view are prioritized in an execution sequence, wherein further the data in the initial form is determined to be in a valid format when a data item specified in the data in the initial form has a non-empty table field, the data item specified in the data in the initial form is in a valid data format, and when the data item falls within a set of range of validation values...”

It is respectfully submitted that the combination of Morris and Moore fails to teach, disclose, or suggest each of the features specified in amended independent claim 1. For example, the aforementioned combination fails to disclose a hierarchical, table-based system of a plurality of rules organized into at least a FIELD view, a CLASS view and a GLOBAL view, wherein the FIELD view is the view of first priority, the CLASS view is the view of second priority and the GLOBAL view is the default view when there is no match to the data in the FIELD and CLASS views. The combination also does not describe that the rules included in each of the FIELD view, the CLASS view and the GLOBAL view are prioritized in a predetermined execution sequence.

Morris discusses a system that compares a managed file at a client with an original backup file stored on an application server whereby only the changed portion of the file (i.e., a delta) is stored at the application server (see Abstract, Figs. 2-4; col. 6, lines 35-39; col. 6, lines 50-67). As such, Morris is not concerned with the data validation service that compares the data in the initial form to validate parameters stored in a hierarchical, table-based system of a plurality of rules.

In particular, Morris fails to describe determining the validity of data based on whether a date item specified in the data has a non-empty table field, a date specified in the data is in a valid date format, and when the date falls within a set of range of dates, as recited in amended claim 1. The Office Action alleges that Morris discusses a validation service which compares data in an initial form to a reference for a particular form utilized by a client application to determine a match, however, Morris only discusses validity in

terms of unmodified files which are returned and modified files which are further inquired about and thus fails to discuss determining the validity of data as recited in amended claim 1.

Moore, relied upon in the Office Action for allegedly curing the deficiencies of Morris, discusses a method of validating a user web browser input that is used to generate a web page in response to the user's input. (FIG. 1-4 and related discussion). In response to a user web input, a validation declaration is drawn from memory which contains parameters that generates a control object hierarchy (i.e. a template) that in turn generates HTML code for display on the user's computer. Moore does not describe a hierarchical, table-based system of a plurality of rules organized into at least a FIELD view, a CLASS view and a GLOBAL view, wherein the FIELD view is the view of first priority, the CLASS view is the view of second priority and the GLOBAL view is the default view when there is no match to the data in the FIELD and CLASS views. Moore also does not describe further the rules included in each of the FIELD view, CLASS view and GLOBAL view are prioritized in a predetermined execution sequence.

Based on the foregoing, the combination of Morris and Moore fails to teach, disclose, or suggest each of the features specified in amended independent claim 1. Therefore, claim 1 is allowable and the rejection of this claim should be withdrawn. Claims 2, 4, 6, and 8 depend from amended independent claim 1, and are thus allowable for at least the same reasons. Therefore, the rejection of these claims should also be withdrawn.

Further, there is no motivation for one of ordinary skill in the art to look to combine Moore with Morris as at least Morris is not analogous art. To be analogous art the references must be within the field of the applicant's endeavor or, if not be reasonable pertinent to the particular problem with which the inventor is concerned. As discussed above, Morris is specifically concerned with comparing file at a client with an original backup file stored on an application server whereby only the changed portion of the file is stored at the application server. Although Morris deals with comparing computerized information, Morris is not in the same field of validating the form of the information as compared to specific stored parameters nor in Morris particularly useful in that endeavor. Therefore, one of ordinary skill in that art would not be motivated to se use Morris in

combination with Moore. MPEP 2141.01 (I). Furthermore, even if there was some similarity, the differences in function described above carry far greater weight against being analogous art. MPEP 2141.01(II). Here the fact that Morris merely compares an old file to a modified version in the same format (although it may be compressed) and stores only the changes is functionally different than a data validation service comparing data in the initial form to validation parameters stored in a hierarchical, table-based system of a plurality of rules. As such Moore is not analogous art and there would be no motivation to look to Morris by one of ordinary skill in the art.

Amended independent claims 10, 19, 31, 36, 37, 40, and 41 all recite similar features as amended independent claim 1 and are thus also allowable for at least the same reasons. Therefore, the rejection of these claims should also be withdrawn. Claims 11, 13, 15, 17, 22, 24-26, 28, 32, 34, and 38 depend from amended independent claims 10, 19, 31, and 37, and are thus allowable for at least the same reasons. Therefore, the rejection of these claims should also be withdrawn.

Claims 3, 5, 7, 9, 12, 14, 16, 18, 20-21, 23, 27, 29-30, 35, and 39

Claims 3, 5, 7, 9, 12, 14, 16, 18, 20-21, 23, 27, 29-30, 35, and 39 are rejected as being unpatentable over Morris in view of Official Notice. The rejection of these claims is respectfully traversed.

Claims 3, 5, 7, 9, 12, 14, 16, 18, 20-21, 23, 27, 29-30, 35, and 39 depend from amended independent claims 1, 10, 19, 31, and 37 and thus specify at least the same features. As discussed above, Morris fails to teach, disclose, or suggest each of the features specified in the aforementioned claims. Therefore, claims 3, 5, 7, 9, 12, 14, 16, 18, 20-21, 23, 27, 29-30, 35, and 39 are allowable over Morris for at least the same reasons. In the Office Action, Official Notice is relied upon for allegedly teaching the use of an LDAP system which is a standardized networking protocol designed for querying and modifying directory services. However, the Official Notice rejection fails to address the additional novel features specified in the claims with respect to a hierarchical, table-based system of a plurality of rules organized into at least a FIELD view, a CLASS view and a GLOBAL view, wherein the FIELD view is the view of first priority, the CLASS view is the view of second priority and the GLOBAL view is the

default view when there is no match to the data in the FIELD and CLASS views. The combination also does not describe further the rules included in each of the FIELD view, CLASS view and GLOBAL view are prioritized in a predetermined execution.

Further, Morris fails to describe a client application server that utilizes data in a particular form and generates a validation request for validation of the data. As discussed above, Morris is concerned with reducing the storage and transportation bandwidth requirement of a file. Morris describes comparing an original file with a modified version and extracting a delta file that encompasses just the changes. Morris does not concern itself with data in a particular form and generates a validation request for validation of the data. As such, Morris fails to describe the subject matter asserted to Morris by the Office Action. As such, the combination of Morris and Official Notice fails to describe each and every claim element. Since the combination of Morris and Official Notice fails to describe each of the features specified in claims 3, 5, 7, 9, 12, 14, 16, 18, 20-21, 23, 27, 29-30, 35, and 39, it is respectfully submitted that these claims are allowable and the rejection of these claims should be withdrawn.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, this application is now in condition for allowance. A notice to this effect is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes, after this amendment, that the application is not in condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to call the Applicant's attorney at the number listed below.

No fees are believed due. However, please charge any additional fees or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-3025.

Date: July 5, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

/Arno T. Naeckel/

Arno T. Naeckel, Reg. #56114

Withers & Keys, LLC
P.O. Box 71355
Marietta, GA 30007-1355
(770) 518-9822